

REMARKS

Claims 15, 71 and 109 were rejected as being indefinite because the definition of R_{11} recites "a substituted or unsubstituted cycloalkylalkyl" twice. One of the "a substituted or unsubstituted cycloalkylalkyl" has been cancelled, thereby obviating the rejection. In addition, the definition of R_{11} in Claims 118, 123 and 147 been amended to make these claims consistent with Claims 15, 71 and 123.

The Examiner also objected to the definition of R_{13} and R_{14} . These definitions have been clarified, thereby obviating the rejection.


The amendments have been made merely to clarify the meaning of the claims. The scope of the claims have not been narrowed and no narrowing is intended.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Steven G. Davis
Registration No. 39,652
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

August 13, 2004